Redesign

- Examine outcomes of surveys, meetings, data for who is participating. In the future surveys should be able to identify who responds
- Members raised concerns about survey as small data set on a particular indicator—results are not strong based on sample size
- HCD should conduct phone interviews to gather relevant information similar to how local governments engage with stakeholders (one-on-one)
- Advisory committee (AC) has a separate purpose and should serve as a sounding board for and provide feedback to the Redesign Working Group (RWG)
- Send RWG meeting agendas to advisory committee 72 hours prior to RWG
- Advisory committee members--particularly those members that attend regularly--can keep people engaged in RWG
- HCD should stagger meetings of AC and RWG and explore option of shorter phone meetings
- Advisory committee should be venue to deal with everyday issues not necessarily covered by redesign
- DOF: Goal is to develop a program that peels back barriers to local governments

HUD TA Providers

- HUD TA providers are finalizing both the Assessment and MOU

2017 Special NOFA

- Members voiced concern that process took too long recommended working with jurisdictions up front with a narrow scope so that applicants don't lose 6-9 months
- Several jurisdictions gave up
- Need a streamlined, simplified process

Other Issues

- Members requested clarification of the use and purpose of set-up reports, asked to change set up report to allow jurisdictions to track budget when doing a cash request, asked reason for set-up report being filled out twice (up front and at end), and requested HCD clarify use of PI in set-up reports
- HCD clarified that only time jurisdictions should be requested to re-do set-up reports is if budget increases
- HCD recommended short term fixes of email clarifications and a phone call with jurisdictions and contract management and fiscal staff
- Redesign will look at set-up report process since jurisdictions respond to set-up report process by holding onto funds until the end which lowers program expenditures
- Members raised issue of organizing completion reports by beneficiary, HCD clarified that the issue was fixed last year and updated forms can be found on website
- Members requested clarifying email from fiscal to define period during which data is required
- Members requested definitions of "6 months data" stated that it makes sense for ongoing services but not for new services
- Members requested information about outstanding PI reports, HCD reported that 124 or 153 have been submitted and 29 are outstanding
- Members raised issue of not being able to use CDBG to pay for a contract city engineer as they have in the past because of a 2014 Procurement Memo which some believe goes beyond federal sole-source rules